

09/727,191

MS150809.01/MSFTP177US

REMARKS

Claims 1-41 are currently pending in the subject application and are presently under consideration. Claims 1, 10, 11, 13-15, 22, 35, 36, 38 have been amended herein, and claims 2, 8, 9, 23, and 39 have been cancelled as shown at pp. 2-9 of this Reply.

Favorable reconsideration of the subject patent application is respectfully requested in view of the comments and amendments herein.

I. Objection to Claim 8

The objection to this claim is moot and should be withdrawn in view of the cancellation of this claim.

II. Rejection of Claims 1-41 Under 35 U.S.C §102(e)

Claims 1-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(e), as being anticipated by Courts *et al.* (U.S. 6,076,108). It is respectfully submitted that this rejection should be withdrawn for at least the following reasons. Courts *et al.* does not teach or suggest each and every limitation of applicants' claimed invention.

Independent claims 1, 22, 36, 38, and 41 recite *reclaims resources allocated to the user context object upon a determination that the user context object has not been accessed within a pre-determined threshold of time*. Courts *et al.* does not disclose this aspect of the subject claim. Rather, Courts *et al.* merely describes expiring Session IDs after a period of inactivity (Col 7, Lines 8-9). Session IDs are not the session data. Courts *et al.* further describes the lifetime of session data spanning a *specified period of time* or by log-in and log-out events (Col 7, Lines 54-56). This is merely a specified period of time, not a pre-determined period of time where the session data has not been accessed.

Claims 12 and 27 recites *locate a user context object via an addressing algorithm, the algorithm employing the globally unique identifier, a locale identifier, a mailbox identifier and a security identifier*. Contrary to assertions in the Office Action, Courts *et al.* does not disclose locating the user context object via *a locale identifier, a mailbox identifier and a security identifier*. Rather, Courts *et al.* merely describes using a Session ID to locate session data.

Claim 15 recites *the pre-determined threshold period of time can be dynamically changed based, at least in part, on feedback concerning the usage of one or more user context*

09/727,191

MS150809.01/MSFTP177US

*objects.* As describes *supra* with respect to the independent claims, Courts *et al.* fails to disclose a pre-determined threshold of time of inactivity associated the user context object, and further fails to disclose dynamically adjusting any threshold time based upon usage of the user context object. Courts *et al.* merely describes a system with multiple copies of the session data stored on several servers and establishing the master copy of the session data based upon the server that is making the most requests for the session data.

Claim 17 recites *more resources are allocated to a user context object when the feedback information indicates that the user context object has been utilized more than a first pre-determined threshold level.* Courts *et al.* fails to describe adjusting resource allocations based upon a *pre-determined threshold level of usage* of a user context object. Rather, Courts *et al.* describes load balancing of web servers based upon requests received by a hub possibly from many users, not based upon a pre-determined threshold of usage of session data.

Claim 19, 21, 32, 33, 34, and 40 recite similar language to claim 17 relating to adjusting resource allocation based upon level of usage of a user context object. Therefore, the subject claims are allowable for at least the same reasons noted above in connection with claim 17.

Claims 14 and 24 recite *the pre-determined period of time being one hour.* As described with respect to the independent claims, Courts *et al.* fails to disclose a pre-determined threshold of time of inactivity associated the user context object let alone the pre-determined threshold being one hour.

In view of at least the foregoing comments, it is readily apparent that the cited reference neither anticipates nor suggests applicants' claimed invention as recited in the subject claims – this rejection should be withdrawn.

09/727,191

MS150809.01/MSFTP177US

**Conclusion**


The present application is believed to be in condition for allowance in view of the above comments and amendments. A prompt action to such end is earnestly solicited.

In the event any fees are due in connection with this document, the Commissioner is authorized to charge those fees to Deposit Account No. 50-1063.

Should the Examiner believe a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact applicants' undersigned representative at the telephone number below.

Respectfully submitted,

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP



Himanshu S. Amin  
Reg. No. 40,894

AMIN & TUROCY, LLP  
24<sup>TH</sup> Floor, National City Center  
1900 E. 9<sup>TH</sup> Street  
Cleveland, Ohio 44114  
Telephone (216) 696-8730  
Facsimile (216) 696-8731